They Worked Their Way Through College Spying for the FBI, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. III, NUMBER 17 MAY 16, 1955 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

A Dramatic New Disarmament Plan and the Projected Four Power Talks

Russia Offers to Lift Its Iron Curtain for Peace

"Missions to Moscow" have become a familiar pre-election phenomena. Mr. Truman in 1948 wooed peace votes by dropping a hint that if elected he would send Vinson to Moscow; nothing more was heard of the idea once the election was over. Churchill won the British elections two years later with a dramatic proposal for a meeting with Truman and Stalin to stop the atomic arms race; that, too, was shelved after the votes were counted. Anthony Eden is depending on the same promise of a meeting "at the summit" to help him win in May, and the U.S. has reluctantly agreed. A bargain seems to have been struck. Britain reversed herself at Paris on Indo-China and forced France to support our protege Diem, and there is reason to suspect that when British elections are safely over it will be seen that Eden has also promised to back the U.S. in defense of Formosa.

To this astringent view must be added a sober look at the men who would meet at or near that summit. The one commanding figure who might have brought peace is in retirement. Eden is a light-weight compared to Churchill; it is not at all clear who, if anybody, is at the top in Moscow. And the President unfortunately is not equipped for the job of leadership; he is a front man, a symbol, an optical illusion. His vapid little speech Tuesday night to the Republican women is a measure of the man; you don't prepare for serious negotiation by insulting in advance those with whom you want to talk. The compromise by which the meeting at the summit will be more or less perfunctory while the Foreign Ministers do the real work is, of course, a dodge. But Mr. Eisenhower really isn't fit to do more than shake hands all around.

Worse Below the Summit

Below the summit, the new British Foreign Secretary, Macmillan, is commonplace, and Dulles is hostile from the start to negotiations. The *Washington Post* Wednesday reported "word from Paris that Dulles wants to raise at the Big Four meeting the issue of the denial of freedom in the Soviet satellites." (Mr. Dulles turns strongly civil libertarian once he gets past the Pripet marshes.) Ludwell Denny, who has become almost an unofficial spokesman, cables that Mr. Dulles has launched a new offensive to utilize the talks to stir disaffection behind Soviet lines and "to head off false hopes . . . that peace is just around the corner."

Yet, despite Mr. Dulles, peace *may* be just around the corner. Last November, in their joint notes to Moscow, the U.S., France and Britain, called for agreement on an Austrian treaty and on free elections for a reunited Germany as the pre-requisites for fruitful Four Power talks. Since then Moscow has indicated that it would accept the Eden plan for free elections in Germany and an Austrian treaty is about to be signed. In addition the new Soviet disarmament proposals spell out in explicit terms a plan to meet Western demands for reduction in conventional arms and armies before nuclear disarmament, and for an effective system of control and inspection to enforce the latter. The new Soviet disarmament proposals mark a new stage in the Russian drive for peace. Moscow has in effect accepted Western terms on Austria, German elections and disarmament. The task of preventing and sabotaging a Four Power settlement has been made very difficult.

No More Atomic Tests

Of all the dramatic events in the movement toward peace, none is more important than the publication of these Soviet disarmament proposals. They will have an enormous appeal everywhere in the world. They would reduce the armies of the Big Three—the U.S., Russia and China—to from 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 men each and those of Britain and France to 650,000 men apiece. They would call off all further tests of atomic weapons. They would follow reduction of conventional armies and arms with the complete prohibition of the hydrogen and atom bombs "and other weapons of mass destruction." They would lift that Iron Curtain to make effective control and inspection possible.

These provisions deserve to be spelled out since few papers in this country have carried them. The General Assembly would establish an international control agency. This would first "set up on the territories of all the respective states along reciprocal lines control posts in big ports, railway junctions, motor roads and airdromes" with the object "of preventing sudden attack by one state upon another." The task of these posts "shall be to watch that there shall be no dangerous concentrations of ground forces or of air and naval forces." The control agency would have access to all governmental decisions and papers pertaining to military budgets as a means of checking on the observance of armament reductions. Finally the control agency, in order to prevent the clandestine accumulation of nuclear and other materials, and other violations of the arms agreement, would have the right to station permanently in every country a staff of international inspectors "who, within the bounds of the control functions they exercise, would have unhindered access at any time to all objects of control."

Our Turn to Prove Sincerity

For months, if not years, the State Department has been asking Moscow to prove its "sincerity" in the search for peace. But the Department instead of being jubilant is struck dumb

(Continued on Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Organized Labor Agrees with the Lawyers Guild on the "Guilt by Anticipation" Bill

A United Front Against the Butler Measure for Industrial Blacklisting

It is not often these days that the organized labor movement finds itself in agreement with the National Lawyers' Guild. Last Tuesday Osmond K. Fraenkel of the Guild and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., as counsel for the United Automobile Workers (and head of Americans for Democratic Action) appeared before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee in opposition to the Butler bill. The preceding Friday the subcommittee had heard from the CIO (through its assistant general counsel Tom Harris), from James B. Carey, president of the I.U.E.-CIO, and from the A.F. of L. This unusual united front measures the extent of the danger labor senses in S 681, the so-called "Defense Facilities Protection Act," a bill for universal security screening in American industry.

Fraenkel termed it a "guilt by anticipation" bill, since it would authorize government officials to determine which employes "may engage in espionage, sabotage or other subversive acts," and deny them employment in so-called "defense facilities." The Senate report on the bill last August admitted it was aimed to cover "privately owned" plants "engaged in what is regarded as normal civilian production."

Carey in his testimony said 2,000,000 employes in more than 18,000 plants with defense contracts are covered by industrial security screening; complained that "vigorous anti-Communist union leaders had been denied clearance as security risks" under these existing procedures; and asserted that "the net effect of the [Butler] bill would be to place in the hands of some government officials the power to condemn to ostracism and starvation, or dependence on public relief, workers in vast sections of the American economy."

Perhaps the hardest hitting of the statements made on behalf of labor was that by Rauh. "The UWA," he said as its general counsel, "is vitally concerned with this proposed bill. Thousands upon thousands of our members are presently covered by the Defense Department's program for screening employes in defense plants. . . . They have seen that program operate; they have seen employes tried on vague charges at hearings based on meaningless criteria and have seen Hearing Boards decide cases on the testimony of unknown informers."

The bill by its terms is aimed at workers who "might" commit espionage, sabotage or "other subversive acts." Rauh criticized this last phrase as "so vague as to be meaningless," and said possible espionage was already covered by existing security procedures covering every kind of secret work. Rauh said the bill was basically an anti-sabotage measure, and pointed out that there was no recorded case of sabotage during World War II "or what is more significant, during the Korean war." Rauh said anyone caught in an attempt at sabotage was already subject to 30 years in jail, no small deterrent. He said the new bill would set up "a nationwide screening of all workers" and added "the moment we start watching everybody, the more certain we are to uncover the non-conformists and the less certain we are to safeguard ourselves against real traitors."

Rauh declared the bill if passed would be administered by "the same Department of Justice which, in using such witnesses as Harvey Matusow and Paul Crouch, vouched for the credibility of known liars" and "in utilizing the files of the FBI to impugn the loyalty of President Truman, demonstrated the potential danger to our democracy in the political use of secret files collected for security purposes."

The CIO in its statement suggested a compromise "new practice" whereby the "identify of FBI undercover agents" could be kept secret while the testimony of associates and fellow employes would be used in security cases only if they appeared openly to testify. This would protect a new crop of Matusows and Crouches from confrontation.

Most disappointing was the way in which labor spokesmen took for granted that a nationwide screening system would be set up under the Internal Security Act of 1950 when and if the Subversive Activities Control Board registration order against the Communist party is upheld by the Supreme Court. Tom Harris for the CIO, Carey, and Walter J. Mason for the A.F. of L. used this as an argument against enactment of the Butler bill. Carey said "hard core" Communists could be excluded from defense facilities without the Butler bill when the registration order went into effect. None of these three faced up to the fact that under the Internal Security Act as amended last August by Senators Humphrey, Morse and Douglas the impact of the blacklisting would go far beyond "hard core" Communists.

Henry Cabot Lodge Blurts Out The Truth About the UN "Loyalty" Purge

The European press covering the recent UNESCO loyalty hearings in Geneva has been quoting with amusement a statement by Henry Cabot Lodge on the real reason for the U. S. loyalty purge in UN agencies. The statement was unearthed by defense counsel Leonard Boudin from testimony which Lodge gave—as U. S. representative to the UN—before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on February 2 of last year. Since this has yet to appear (so far as we know) in the U. S. press, we give it here. The testimony also throws some vivid light on the U. S. attitude toward the UN during the Korean war.

"It was obvious," Mr. Lodge told the House committee, "that U. S. national security was not affected by the character of these U. S. employes. In the first place, the UN is not only not a government; it has none of the powers of government. Everything that it does is purely recommendatory, except for the Security Council, and in that body there is the veto which protects us completely. This is one difference between the UN and the U. S. government.

"**Secondly, in the UN** there is no secret or classified information. THE ONLY INFORMATION WHICH THE UNITED NATIONS EVER RECEIVED ABOUT THE WAR IN KOREA, FOR EXAMPLE, WAS MIMEOGRAPHED MATERIAL WHICH I TRANSMITTED AFTER THE PENTAGON HAD RELEASED IT TO THE PRESS. There is, therefore, nothing to spy on in the UN. No U. S. citizen working there has ever been indicted for spying. Perhaps it is because there is nothing to spy on that the Soviet has never filled their quota of employees. . . .

"The prime consideration, as regards employment of U. S. citizens by the UN, therefore, is one of justice and of a sense of the general fitness of things. It boils down to the fact that it is clearly wrong for any U. S. Communist to be employed at the UN when there are so many good Americans from which to choose."

The Administrative Tribunal at Geneva, in ordering the reinstatement or payment of damages to three employes [David Leff, Peter Duberg and Annette Wilcox], held that the integrity required of international civil servants was not to be identified with "loyalty" to their governments, and that they were guaranteed "entire freedom of conscience . . . in respect of both their philosophical convictions and their political opinions."

In the background is one of those few questions on which the U. S. and the U.S.S.R. have agreed at the UN. Both objected when the General Assembly established a system of administrative tribunals with power to hear appeals from dismissed personnel. The Czech government several times tried to obtain the discharge of UN employes of Czech nationality who were no longer regarded as "loyal" to the Communist regime. On those occasions the U. S. threw its influence against dismissal on loyalty charges.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They Worked Their Way Through College Spying for the FBI

A New Type Informer in the South's First Smith Act Case

Three paid informers, members of the Justice Department's Smith Act troupe, have just completed a performance in the first prosecution of a Southern Communist. They gave the testimony that led to the conviction of Junius Irving Scales under the membership clause of the Act.

Scales, leader of the Communist Party in the Carolinas, admitted his membership. What he denied was the rest of the government's charge: that the party advocated the violent overthrow of the government, that he knew its purpose and intended to help carry it out.

The three informers made the charge stick.

First to take the stand in the Federal District Court in Greensboro, N. C., was John Lautner, a former Communist now a Justice Department consultant at $125 a week. Lautner presented testimony he has perfected before many courts and government boards. He described the ultimate aim of the Party in the U. S.: to "bring about the destruction by force and violence" of imperialistic capitalism. He spent a day identifying as Communist literature numerous books and pamphlets that probably included some things Scales had read.

Then for local color, the government called Ralph Clontz, Charlotte, N. C. attorney, who began to spy on Scales for the FBI while still attending Duke University, and Charles Benson Childs, a young University of North Carolina physics student who had also joined the Party for the FBI. This led Scales' attorney David Rein to remark in his final address to the jury that "apparently now it's the fashion to work your way through school by working for the FBI."

Red Troops in the Carolinas

According to Clontz, who was "not interested in money" but nevertheless reached a point where the FBI paid him $400 a month, Scales talked of little else but force and violence whenever they met. "Force is the only answer," he claims Scales told him. "Ideas alone can never accomplish anything."

To an all-white, largely middle-class Southern jury, he recounted Scales' plan to unite the "Negro nation" and the working class into a revolutionary force that would be aided, if necessary, by troops from Russia. As added catnip, he told of Scales' prediction that Clontz's daughter would marry in a Socialist or Communist United States, a statement that probably chilled twelve Southern marrows with its hint of miscegenation. He pictured Scales plotting the overthrow of the U. S. from his home in Carboro, and at the same time he estimated there were only 20 Communists in all of North Carolina.

Taught to Kill—With A Pencil

The other student informer, Childs, took the stand as a "surprise" witness since he had paid up his Party dues only a few days before. He told, for instance, of a secret school for Communists on a North Carolina farm, where someone, not Scales, had shown him how to kill a man with a plain wooden pencil. He then demonstrated this useful skill to the court. He also said that while he was working for Western Electric once, he told Scales of certain anti-Red pamphlets the company was distributing to its employees and was advised to keep a list of the authors so they could be lined up and shot "after the revolution." (Under cross-examination he admitted he never made such a list and that Scales never mentioned the matter again.)

Scales' mother appeared in his behalf. She told how Scales, grand nephew of a governor and son of a wealthy Greensboro attorney, had left that life and joined the Party to help his fellow man. He told her he wouldn't belong to the party if it advocated the use of violence. And she quoted him as saying, "To my mind it would be just plain silly for a little minority group to try to overthrow the government." and also: "the only way is to educate the people . . . if they wanted it (Communism) all right, and if not, all right." (But "What would you expect a mother to say?" the U. S. District Attroney asked the jury.) Finally two professors who had taught Scales at the U. of N. C. and a minister who also knew him, characterized him as "Sincere, honest but misguided."

Scales was sentenced to six years. Since his indictment last November, he had been free under a $35,000 bond his mother posted. Judge Albert V. Bryan, who presided at the trial, revoked it and he is in jail. A judge of the appellate court also refused to reinstate the bond and Rein is presently appealing to Chief Justice Warren.

Scales is the second person to be convicted under a provision of the Smith Act making it a crime to be a member of a party which advocates overthrow of the government by force and violence. Earlier this year Claude Lightfoot of Chicago was also convicted of "membership" and sentenced to five years in jail and a $5,000 fine.

The McCarran Act May Help the Communists

Until the Lightfoot conviction, all Smith Act prosecutions had been for "conspiracy to advocate." If these new convictions are upheld, the government could prosecute every one of the 23,000-odd Communists in this country for membership.

The main hurdle on appeal is Section 4f of the Internal Security (McCarran) Act of 1950. This says that no one may be held guilty of a crime merely because he is an official or member of the Communist party. The intent of the late Senator McCarran in adding this provision was not, of course, to help Communists. Section 4f was put into the 1950 Act to safeguard its requirement that all Communists register.

Section 4f was intended to safeguard the registration provision from attack under the Fifth amendment. Communists cannot be forced to register if registration would incriminate them. But one of the byproducts may be to make it impossible for the government to prosecute anyone for membership alone. If Lightfoot and Scales finally go free, it will be because Senator McCarran was so clever a lawyer he ended by out-foxing himself.

"Overthrow" as Fantasy

In an editorial on the Scales case, in which it attacks the government's use of paid informers, the Raleigh, N. C., News and Observer says [April 15] it regards as "almost comic the contention that he (Scales) could have conspired in anything but fantasy to overthrow the government of the United States." It then goes on to say later in the piece: "National security is a very important thing. Even so insignificant a danger as Junius Scales may deserve attention in that connection. Some real questions of national security, however, rise when justice may be shaped on the basis of the testimony of the expelled Communist who is now the regularly hired paid informer."

Can Ideas Be Tried?

"I am innocent of the charge in this case. Insofar as the issues are Marxism-Leninism and my beliefs, I do not feel they can be tried in a courtroom.

"No jury is competent to convict a man for ideas, no matter how long a study they make. The jury had small opportunity with the rags and tatters of unfamiliar books introduced and misrepresented by the government.

"For all the world it has been like a medieval trial for heresy."

—Junius Scales' final statement at the time of sentencing.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATO Chief General Gruenther Was Alarmed at the First Sign of a Soviet Surrender

Will We Be The Ones to Balk Now That Our Terms Are Accepted?

(Continued from Page One)

when Russia goes so far as to offer to open her airdromes and factories to foreign inspection. There could not be a more striking about face on the part of the Russians. Now it is our turn to prove our sincerity. The price of the deal is the reunification and neutralization of Germany, the evacuation of foreign armies from the Reich, and the abandonment of our forward bombing bases in Europe, Africa and Asia. Russia is offering in effect to retreat to her borders if we retreat to ours, to establish a neutral *cordon sanitaire* between us and to open her own territory to inspection as assurance against hostile or aggressive intentions on her part. Here is a basis on which there could be negotiated a secure planet for all mankind.

The Slide Toward An Atomic Precipice

In a speech to the American Irish Historical Society on May 7, Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray warned, "Today we stand on the edge of the abyss of atomic annihilation. Daily the threat of world destruction grows measure by measure. . . . In this slide toward the precipice whence can we be saved?" Never before has there been so real an opportunity to stop the slide toward that precipice. A year ago it was the U.S. which proposed continuous and permanent teams of international inspectors. A year ago it was the Soviet Union which still declined to "talk turkey" on inspection and insisted that it would not agree to reduce its armies until we had first agreed to atomic disarmament. Today the U.S.S.R. has accepted American terms and spelled them out in great detail. Will we be the ones to balk?

Precisely because the Soviet Union is accepting our terms, it is in a position to wage a diplomatic offensive deadly to American prestige if we do not seize this opportunity sincerely to negotiate atomic peace. The Soviet about face began last October when Vishinsky at the UN General Assembly accepted the Anglo-French atomic proposals of June, 1954, as the basis for negotiations. The result was a resolution calling for the resumption of disarmament discussions and this resolution was the first of its kind since 1946 to be sponsored jointly by the Soviet Union and the Western Powers. Vishinsky agreed to Western demands that any disarmament start with conventional armies. This Russian reversal created dismay in Western military circles, and was attacked by General Gruenther, the head of the NATO armies, in a speech the very day after Vishinsky's.

Our military leaders are fascinated by atomic war and have based all their plans upon it. These men will do their best to prevent agreement, but that becomes more difficult when the Soviets accept our terms. The Russians are in a position to force us sincerely to negotiate or stand exposed before all mankind. They are also in a position to negotiate independently whether we wish to or not. The Austrian treaty, and the denunciation of the Soviet pacts with Britain and France, clear the way for direct negotiations between the Russians and the Germans. The latter understand very well what atomic war would mean to Germany, while our Western allies understand very well how dangerous to them would be a separate agreement between the Germans and the Russians. We will be forced to move toward peace whether we want to or not.

They, Too, Negotiate from Strength

We have talked about negotiating from strength, but now both sides can negotiate from strength—the equal possession of the new terrible weapons of human self-destruction. Proposals the Russians could not accept before, they can accept now when they too have the H and A bomb. What they fear is what we ought also to fear: a war neither side could win, and the rearming of the one nation which might try again for world dominion with the new weapons.

It is the duty of every thoughtful human being to bring these Russian proposals to the attention of their fellow citizens, to show how far they go in embodying American demands the Russians had formerly rejected, and to support those forces in our government which want (as Secretary of Defense Wilson said at press conference last week) a "cooling off" period in which the momentum toward war may be reversed and an end of the arms race negotiated. There may not be another chance.

IFS Speaks Sunday, May 15 at 11:15 a.m. Before The Ethical Society, 1822 Mass. Ave., Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone..... State.....

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone..... State.....

* $1 extra for Canada. 5/16/55

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED